

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067),  
2 steven.bauer@lw.com  
Robert E. Sims (Bar No. 116680),  
3 bob.sims@lw.com  
David M. Friedman (Bar No. 209214),  
4 david.friedman@lw.com  
Heather L. Thompson (Bar No. 246321),  
5 heather.thompson@lw.com  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
6 San Francisco, California 94111-6538  
Telephone: +1.415.391.0600  
7 Facsimile: +1.415.395.8095

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
Carl W. Jasper  
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
13

14 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 CARL W. Jasper,

18 Defendant.  
19

CASE NO. CV 07-6122 (HRL)

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION

Dated: December 7, 2007

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
Steven M. Bauer  
Robert E. Sims  
David F. Friedman  
Heather L. Thompson

By /s/  
Heather L. Thompson  
Attorneys for Defendant  
Carl W. Jasper

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

EXHIBIT A

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067),  
2 steven.bauer@lw.com  
Robert E. Sims (Bar No. 116680),  
3 bob.sims@lw.com  
David M. Friedman (Bar No. 209214),  
4 david.friedman@lw.com  
Heather L. Thompson (Bar No. 246321),  
5 heather.thompson@lw.com  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
6 San Francisco, California 94111-2562  
Telephone: +415.391.0600  
7 Facsimile: +415.395.8095

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
Carl W. Jasper

9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 IN RE MAXIM INTEGRATED  
PRODUCTS, INC. DERIVATIVE  
13 LITIGATION

CASE NO. C. 06-3344 JW

DEFENDANT CARL W. JASPER'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO DETERMINE  
14 WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED TO  
15 CASE NO. 06-3344 JW

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendant Carl W. Jasper (“Mr. Jasper”) hereby moves the Court for consideration of whether the matter *SEC v. Carl W. Jasper*, Case No. 07-CV-6122-HRL (filed December 4, 2007) (“*SEC v. Jasper*”) is related, as defined by Civil Local Rule 3-12, to this action (*In re Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. Derivative Litigation- “In re Maxim”*).

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) states that cases are related when:

(1) The cases concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and

(2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor or expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

Both factors are met here. Both cases spring from challenges to Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.’s stock option practices, in other words, both cases “concern substantially the same [...] transaction or event.” Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(1). Further, the *SEC v. Jasper* and *In re Maxim* cases should be assigned to the same judge to promote judicial economy. If the cases proceeded in front of separate judges, each judge would be required to educate himself or herself as to the same set of transactions as well as similar legal arguments being made by both plaintiffs and defendants. Furthermore, Mr. Jasper, as a defendant in both actions, will be required to defend the same or substantially similar actions before two different judges. In short, allowing these cases to proceed separately “will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense” that may lead to conflicting results. Civil L. R. 3-12(a)(2).

Counsel for Mr. Jasper has notified all parties in this case as well as in *Sec v. Jasper* of Mr. Jasper’s intent to file this administrative motion. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12(f), Mr. Jasper respectfully requests that this Court grant its Motion and order the *SEC v. Jasper* and *In Re Maxim* cases related.

1 Dated: December 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

Steven M. Bauer

Robert E. Sims

David M. Friedman

Heather L. Thompson

5 By \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Heather L. Thompson

Attorneys for Defendant

Carl W. Jasper